

Appl. No. 09/963,819
Atty. Docket No. CM2435
Amdt. dated July 26, 2004
Reply to Final Rejection of March 2, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 2, 5, 7-14 and 16 are now in the case.

Applicants appreciate and acknowledge the mention by the Examiner that claim 16 is allowed.

Applicants have amended claims 2, 5, 7-14 to correct their dependency, as well as, typographical and grammatical errors.

Each of these amendments is supported by the specification, claims and drawings as filed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-8 and 11-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beaulieu in view of either Toetschinger et al., Kildow or Baker.

Claim 9-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beaulieu in view of either Toetschinger et al., Kildow or Baker and further in view of either Widman or Kuntz.

Applicants submit that claims 2, 5, 7-14 have been amended to correct their dependency.

Since claims 2, 5, 7-14 now depend on allowed claim 16, it is Applicants' position that the amendments overcome the rejection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

It is submitted that all the claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action on all claims is therefore requested.

If the next action is other than to allow the claims, the favor of a telephonic interview is requested with the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,
Bredo et al.

By 

Thibault Fayette
Attorney for Applicants
(513) 627-4593

July 26, 2004
Customer No. 27752